



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,857	12/02/2003	Paul Thomas Knowles	1801270.00132US1	5597
23483 7590 04/02/2007 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP 60 STATE STREET BOSTON, MA 02109			EXAMINER WU, JUNCHUN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2191	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/02/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 04/02/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

teresa.carvalho@wilmerhale.com
tina.dougal@wilmerhale.com
michael.mathewson@wilmerhale.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/726,857

Applicant(s)

KNOWLES, PAUL THOMAS

Examiner

Junchun Wu

Art Unit

2191

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may preclude any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 12, 14, 19-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8-11, 13, 15-18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/29/2004; 9/15/2005
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-28 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Krueger (US Pat. No. 7,003,762 B2).

4. For claim 1, Krueger teaches a method of handling exceptions encountered during the translation of subject program code into target code, comprising: detecting the occurrence of an exception (col.1 lines 53-60); selecting a level of subject context precision required for the detected exception from a plurality of possible levels of precision; and invoking a signal handler to handle the detected exception using the selected level of precision (col.2 lines 29-32 & lines 60-64; the exception handling may handle different types of exceptions).

5. For claim 2, Krueger teaches the exception occurrence detecting step detects the occurrence of an exception signal during translation of the subject program code (col.2 lines 9-12).

6. For claim 3, Krueger teaches the target code generated by the translation invokes a proxy signal handler to handle the detected exception (col.2 12-16 & Fig. 2).

7. For claim 4, Krueger teaches the exception occurrence detecting step detects the occurrence of an exception signal during execution of the target code (col.3 lines 19-22).

8. For claim 5, Krueger teaches a target operating system invokes a proxy signal handler to handle the detected exception (col.2 12-16 & Fig. 2).

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 12, 19-25, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Krishnaswamy (US Pub. No. 20010013118 A1).

11. For a claim 12, Krishnaswamy teaches in a method of handling subject code exceptions in a translation system employing a translator to translate subject code to target code ([0013] lines 1-3), the steps comprising: generating a target context ([0025] & Fig.3); reconstructing a subject context using said target context, thereby generating a reconstructed subject context

Art Unit: 2191

[[0031]]; and executing a translated version of a subject signal handler associated with a particular said exception using the reconstructed subject context ([0035] lines 9-13).

12. For a claim 19, Krishnaswamy teaches step of reconstructing a subject context is performed by proxy signal handler code ([0034] lines 4-8).

13. For a claim 20, Krishnaswamy teaches proxy signal handler code is registered in the target code by said translator and wherein said translator further raises a flag to said proxy signal handler indicating which of said plurality of subject context precision levels is to be used in response to said particular exception ([0009] lines 4-14).

14. For a claim 21, Krishnaswamy teaches particular exception is detected during decoding of the subject code by said translator ([0003] lines 5-9).

15. For a claim 22, Krishnaswamy teaches translator responds to detection of said particular exception during decoding to plant target code which generates said target context and invokes operation of the proxy signal handler code ([0010] lines 1-7).

16. For a claim 23, Krishnaswamy teaches particular exception arises during execution of said target code ([0029] lines 1-3).

Art Unit: 2191

17. For a claim 24, Krishnaswamy teaches a target operating system responds to occurrence of said particular exception during execution of said target code to pass target context to said proxy signal handler code ([0010] lines 1-5).

18. For a claim 25, Krishnaswamy teaches after receiving said target context, said proxy signal handler code calls the translator, which then invokes a selected translated subject signal handler ([0034] lines 4-8).

19. For a claim 28, Krishnaswamy teaches proxy signal handler code is arranged to interact with a subject register bank ([0009] lines 1-3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. Claims 6, 7, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Krueger, and in view of Gokingco et al. hereinafter "Gokingco" ("Porting software from an MC68040 to an MC68060, April 6, 1995").

22. For a claim 6, Krueger does not teach the default level of subject context precision is a last known stack frame, but Gokingco teaches the default level of subject context precision is a

Art Unit: 2191

last known stack frame (Sec. 3.0, 3rd paragraph; when an exception occurs, the stack frame was created by system as default level).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Krueger's teachings by adding the default level of subject context precision is a last known stack frame by Gokingco in order to provide information to the exception and to provide a way to return to normal processing (Gokingco, Sec. 3.0, 4th paragraph lines 1-2).

23. For a claim 7, Krueger does not teach the last known stack frame includes a last known stack pointer value, a base pointer value, and a program counter register value, but Gokingco teaches the last known stack frame includes a last known stack pointer value, a base pointer value (Sec. 3.0, 5th paragraph lines 1-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Krueger's teachings by adding the last known stack frame includes a last known stack pointer value, a base pointer value by Gokingco in order to distinguish among different stack frame types and values (Gokingco, Sec. 3.0, 5th paragraph lines 6-7).

24. For a claim 14, Krueger does not teach step of reconstructing a subject context comprises selecting one of a plurality of subject context precision levels for processing said exception, but Gokingco teaches step of reconstructing a subject context comprises selecting one of a plurality

Art Unit: 2191

of subject context precision levels for processing said exception (Sec. 3.0, 4th paragraph lines 2-6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Krueger's teachings by adding step of reconstructing a subject context comprises selecting one of a plurality of subject context precision levels for processing said exception by Gokingco in order to using v-table to dispatch each exception types to actual exception handler (Gokingco, Sec. 3.0, 4th paragraph).

25. Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Krishnaswamy, and in view of Gokingco et al. hereinafter "Gokingco" ("Porting software from an MC68040 to an MC68060, April 6, 1995").

26. For a claim 26, Krishnaswamy does not teach exception is caused by one of a plurality of asynchronous external events and wherein said exception is handled using a selected default level of precision assigned to all asynchronous events, but Gokingco teaches exception is caused by one of a plurality of asynchronous external events (Sec. 3.0, 2nd paragraph lines 1-3) and wherein said exception is handled using a selected default level of precision assigned to all asynchronous events (Sec. 3.0, 6th paragraph lines 1-3, using stack frame as a default level to determine the cause of the exception and handle the exception).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Krishnaswamy's teachings by adding exception is caused by one of a plurality of asynchronous external events and wherein said exception is handled using a

Art Unit: 2191

selected default level of precision assigned to all asynchronous events by Gokingco in order to provide information to the exception and to provide a way to return to normal processing (Gokingco, Sec. 3.0, 4th paragraph lines 1-2).

27. For a claim 27, Krishnaswamy does not teach selected default level is a last known stack frame, but Gokingco teaches selected default level is a last known stack frame (Sec. 3.0, 3rd paragraph; when an exception occurs, the stack frame was created by system as default level).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Krishnaswamy's teachings by adding selected default level is a last known stack frame by Gokingco in order to provide information to the exception and to provide a way to return to normal processing (Gokingco, Sec. 3.0, 4th paragraph lines 1-2).

Allowable Subject Matter

28. Claims 8-11, 13, and 15-18, objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2191

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Junchun Wu whose telephone number is 571-270-1250. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-17:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Junchun Wu



WEI ZHEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER